DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 042 440 JC 700 201

AUTHOR	Aughinbaugh, Lorine, Ed.
TITLE	Evaluation of Reality.
INSTITUTION	California Junior Coll. Association, Sacramento.
PUB DATE	70
NOTE	40p.; Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Conference for Directors of Institutional Research in California Junior Colleges, Asilomar, California, April 27-29, 1970
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.10
DESCRIPTORS	Activism, *Conference Reports, *Conferences, Decision Making, Educational Innovation, *Educational Research, Educational Technology, Ethnic Studies, *Junior Colleges, Minority Groups, School Community Relationship, Teacher Militancy
IDENTIFIERS	*California

ABSTRACT

Significant junior college problems and research approaches to them are outlined in this conference report. Beside providing a comprehensive description of proceedings, the report presents the results of discussion groups made up of the conference participants. The participants in these discussion groups assumed themselves members of junior college research and development committees. Each group formulated investigative approaches to one of the six following areas of needed junior college research: Black and Third World opportunity programs, educational decision making, innovations and educational technology, the effects of the community college on the community, student activism, and faculty militancy. Their results provide a frame of reference for future study in these areas. (JO)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED042440

EVALUATION OF REALITY

PROCEEDINGS OF THE SIXTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE FOR DIRECTORS OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH IN CALIFORNIA JUNIOR COLLEGES

Asilomar Conference Grounds, Pacific Grove, California

April 27-29, 1970

Sponsored by the California Junior College Association

and

the CJCA Committee on Research and Development

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

SEP 25 1970

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

JC 700 201

Edited by Lorine Aughinbaugh
American River College

CALIFORNIA JUNIOR COLLEGE ASSOCIATION

COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

1969-70

Dr. Frank C. Pearce, Chairman
Dean of Instruction, College of San Mateo

Mrs. Lorine A. Aughinbaugh
Assistant Dean of Research, American River College

Mr. Max D. Bell
Deputy Superintendent, Administration, Mt. San Antonio College

Mr. Walter L. Brooks
Counselor, Shasta College

Mrs. Anna Gale Davis
Psychology Instructor, Los Angeles Pierce College

Mr. Robert J. Fitch
Director of Institutional Research, Cerritos College

Dr. Otto A. Heinkel
Director of Research, San Diego Community Colleges

Dr. Robert Horton
President, Los Angeles Valley College

Dr. James W. Keene
Director of Institutional Research, San Joaquin Delta College

Dr. Thomas F. MacMillan
Research Director, Santa Barbara City College

Dr. Thomas B. Merson
Dean of Instruction, Bakersfield College

Dr. M.Stephen Sheldon
Director, Danforth Foundation Project, Graduate School of Education, UCLA

Mr. George W. Vinnedge
Member of Board of Trustees, Chaffey Junior College District

CONTENTS

FOREWORD iv

SETTING THE STAGE 1

OPENING SESSION: . . . . . .

Review and Preview
Frank C. Pearce 6

SECOND SESSION:

What Do You Hear?
Anna Gale Davis 8

Materials Given to Workshop Participants 9

Discussion Topics for Workshop Groups 12

Group 1
Black and Third World Opportunity Programs: Expansion or Extortion? 13

Group 2
Educational Decision-Making: Who Decides? Who Decides? . . 16

Group 3
Innovations and Educational Technology: Hawthorne, Halo or Hutzpah? 19

Group 4
The "Community" in the Community College: Extending the Reach 23

Group 5
Student Activism: Thrust or Threat? 26

Group 6
Faculty Militancy: Quis Custodes Ipsos Custodiet? 28

FINAL SESSION

Workshop Summary 30

EVALUATION OF THE CONFERENCE 34

APPENDIX

List of Conference Registrants

FOREWORD

As one reviews the titles of this and the five preceding conferences sponsored by the CJCA Research and Development Committee: (1) Institutional Research in the Junior College--Process and Product; (2) Strengthening Junior College Education through Research and Development; (3) Research in the Junior College: Modes, Models, and Manpower; (4) Development and Use of a Common Data Bank; (5) Evaluating Your College and (6) Evaluation of Reality, one is also reviewing the growth of research in the junior colleges of the state. The first conferences were concerned with what research was, or should be, and who should do it and of what value it could be to an institution. The next concern dealt with the tools needed to do the task. The last two conferences have accepted the fact that research is a vital function on the campus and have been concerned with how to best provide the answers which are needed by the institution through research. A future concern could be that of the role of the researcher in the implementation of answers by faculty and administration once they have been provided through research.

The growth and production coming from the two regional research organizations in the north and south was discussed with interest. The Nor Cal Project has received national recognition and other such consortium efforts are under consideration by both groups.

As conference chairman I would like to thank the many people who were responsible for the sixth CJCA Research & Development conference. Space does not permit a listing of each individual and his special contribution; however, I am certain that each conference participant would feel that a special word of appreciation should be given to Dr. Frank Pearce for his work the past two years as chairman of the Research & Development Committee. We all regret that he is leaving the field of research but know that he will still be available for consultation when needed. Many participants also expressed regret that Dr. Tom Merson was unable to be with us due to the death of his brother. He has been one of the strongest proponents of research at the Community College level and we look forward to his joining us again in 1970.

Institutional research is receiving justifiable recognition in many colleges in the state. It is the hope of those involved in this conference that we have been of some assistance in increasing this number.

Lorine A. Aughinbaugh
Conference Chairman

"SETTING THE STAGE"

M. Stephen Sheldon, Director, Danforth Foundation Project
Graduate School of Education, UCLA

Dr. Sheldon reviewed the planning for the conference, the concern of the Research & Development committee members with the role of research, if any, in assisting institutions of higher education to meet the current demands being placed upon them by various segments of their population, the need for junior colleges to grow in their concept of what constitutes research and how the outcomes of research can be used as effective tools for planning. He then introduced the members of the conference program committee who outlined what was to be expected in the following two days.

Anna Gale Davis, Psychology Instructor, Los Angeles Pierce College

When we come together tomorrow morning, we are going to ask all participants to be prepared to assume roles, hopefully not those which they normally fill - for example - a Dean of Instruction could assume the role of a black student, a President could assume the role of a militant faculty member or an activist community representative. By this technique we hope that the conference members will become immersed in the problems to be considered as we discuss "Evaluation of Reality."

Tom MacMillan, Research Director, Santa Barbara City College

At the December meeting of the Research & Development Committee the theme for the Asilomar Conference was set, and it was agreed to hold several small group sessions on key topics in the "Evaluation of Reality."

A number of general areas were proposed, and Steve Sheldon and I agreed to share responsibility for planning the specific topics and setting a more clearly defined task for each of the sub-groups. It has been assumed that the groups will be as flexible as possible, with the opportunity for the greatest exchange of views. It is also assumed that the tone of the group discussions will be set by the papers and presentations this evening, and by the role playing activity tomorrow morning.

On January 6, Steve and I met in San Francisco and arrived at the topics in their final form: (1) Black and Third World Opportunity Programs: Expansion or Extortion? (2) Educational Decision Making: Who Decides? Who Decides? (3) Innovations and Educational Technology: Hawthorne, Halo or Hutzpah? (4) The "Community" in the Community College: Extending the Reach. (5) Student Activism: Thrust or Threat? (6) Faculty Militancy: Quis Custodes Ipsos Custodiet?

One of the important efforts in recruiting resource people for Asilomar has been to bring Board members, faculty members, administrators not usually responsible for research, and students to the conference to broaden the base for discussion. Bill Deegan, CJCA, and a student revolutionary from MPC should stimulate the discussion on student activism. The presence of Jack Smart and Chuck McIntyre from CCHE should be helpful in the decision-making discussion. Lou Reiss will be the discussion leader on the issue of faculty militancy.

If you feel as I do, it will be difficult to stay with one workshop for each offers exciting possibilities. However, because each workshop should have some relevance for each California community college, we sincerely hope that you will continue with the workshop to which you are assigned.

Tom introduced the Discussion Leaders, Consultants and Recorders for each of the six workshops.

Frank Pearce, Chairman, Dean of Instruction, College of San Mateo (for Tom Merson)

Each of you received a packet of materials when you registered. One of these materials was a "Worksheet for Discussion Group." This has been prepared as a guideline for the discussion. At the close of the 3:15 to 5:00 session on Tuesday, the Recorders will bring a written summary of each workshop to Milton Sanden and me here in the Nautilus Living Room. These summaries will be prepared for distribution and presentation on Wednesday.

Otto Heinkel, Director of Research, San Diego Community Colleges

It was my assignment to collect current community college projects which might be helpful as resource materials for the workshops - or of general interest to research personnel. This I have done with the help of many of you who responded to my plea for assistance. They are located on the tables at the back of the room and I believe in sufficient quantity that there are copies for each attendant.

List of research papers available at the conference.

American River College

Credit/No Credit Evaluation Study May, 1969 - Revised August, 1969

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges

ERIC Publications List
How to Use ERIC
Order Blanks
ERIC Research Review (Sample Copy)
Resumes of reports available on conference topics
..Evaluation of the First Year of Operation of the Contra Costa College Mobile Counseling Center
..Community Services: An Emerging Challenge for the Community College
..Community Services: A Center for Community Development
..Community Relations and Services in the Junior Colleges: Proceedings from Two Workshops (San Antonio, Texas, March 21-22, 1969; Moline, Ill., March 28-29, 1969)
..Focus on Action: A Handbook for Developing Junior Colleges
..Quantitative Methods for Administrative Decision Making in Junior Colleges
..The Development of a Proposed Model for Locating and Establishing Comprehensive Public Community Junior Colleges in the United States
..Decision-Making in Community Colleges
..Dissent and the College Student in Revolt
..Student Activism in Junior Colleges: An Administrator's Views
..Student Protest in the Junior College: A National Survey of Student Unrest and Protest Activities in the Junior College
..Survey of Faculty Regarding Campus Incidents of March 10-14
..Proposed Junior College Administrative Action and Reaction to the Student Activist
..Strategies for Improving Remedial English in the Community Colleges
..Individualization of Instruction: The Junior College Takes a Page from the Elementary-Secondary Notebook
..The Preparation of Faculty for the Implementation of Innovations in Curriculum and Instruction: Guidelines for Orientation and In-Service Education Programs
..Videotaped Instruction for the Teaching of Skills
..The Future is Now!; Report of a Workshop for New Junior College Deans of Instruction (Los Angeles, July 7-12, 1969)
..Faculty-Administration Conflict in California Public Junior Colleges: An Analysis and a Proposal for Resolution
..Call to Action: A Committee Progress Report with Recommendations for Action
..A Study of Academic Success of College Readiness Students at the College of San Mateo

..A Long Term Study of the Results of Special Counseling and Instructional Techniques used with Students with seemingly low Academic Potential as Measured by Merritt College Classification Tests
..Fundamentals Learning Laboratories in Industrial Education Centers, Technical Institutes and Community Colleges in North Carolina
..Black Studies in the State of Illinois: A Directory

Bakersfield College

A Study of the Less Able Student in Bakersfield College, 1962

Laney College

Achievement of Veterans in Junior College (Copy of Reprint from Dissertation Abstracts)

Long Beach City College

Follow-up Study of Long Beach City College Graduates
Follow-up Study of Long Beach City College Graduates - Bulletin to the Faculty

Los Angeles City College

Questionnaire Follow-up Study of LACC Transfers Attending California State College, Los Angeles, Spring, 1968
Academic Performance of LACC Transfers to California State College at Los Angeles, 1967-68
Academic Performance of LACC Transfers Entering the University of California during the Academic Year 1967-68
Survey of Faculty Regarding Campus Incidents of March 10-14
The Developmental Studies and Tutorial Programs: Progress Report
The Fall, 1969 Student Counselor Assistant Program: An Evaluation
Opinionnaire Study of LACC Students, Spring, 1969
Follow-up Study of the 1968 Graduating Class
The 1968-69 Student Counselor Assistant Program: Persistence and Scholarship Statistics
Project Summer Session 1968: A Follow-up Report
Academic Performance of LACC Transfers in Their First Semester at San Fernando Valley State College, 1965-68
Questionnaire Survey of LACC Evening Students, Spring, 1969
Academic Performance of LACC Transfers Entering the University of California During the Academic Year 1968-69
The School and College Ability Test (SCAT) and LACC Entering Students 1958-69

Orange Coast College District

They Answered Twice
Holding Power
They Didn't Come Back
Use of In-Class Questionnaires at the Orange Coast Junior College District

Ins and Outs - How They Answer, Fall,1968 - Spring,1969
How They See It
Here They Are

Project Follow-Through: Progress Report I, January, 1969
Progress Report II, November, 1969

San Diego Community Colleges

Grade and ACT Score Summarization by Subject
..San Diego City College
..San Diego Mesa College
..San Diego Evening College
Analysis of Former San Diego City College Students Who Transferred to Four-Year Institutions
Evaluation of Simulation as a Teaching Device
Evaluation of a General Studies Program for the Potentially Low Academic Achiever in California Junior Colleges
An Assessment of the Use of the American College Testing Program for Prediction of Grades in Junior Colleges
An Analysis of the Usefulness of Simulation Games in Affecting Attitudinal Changes and Skill-Type Learning
Cost Summary - Eleven Largest Multi-Campus Districts 1968-1969
Grading Practices in Nine Key General Education Requirement Courses - San Diego Mesa College
Comparison of Gross Persistence Ratios in the San Diego Community Colleges to the California State Averages for Junior Colleges

Skyline College

Student Enrollment Data - Fall, 1969

Opening Session

REVIEW AND PREVIEW

*FRANK C. PEARCE, Dean of Instruction, College of San Mateo
Chairman, R&D Committee

The CJCA Committee on Research and Development has met as a committee of the whole four times during the 1969-70 college year. This included meetings at Los Angeles City College, Chaffey College, University of California, Los Angeles, and at Asilomar prior to the annual conference. In addition, a series of ad hoc and special committee meetings have been held centering around topics such as a "Common Data Bank for California Community Colleges" and "Training of Researchers for California Community Colleges."

Activities of the Committee on Research and Development of the California Junior College Association have been concerned with several areas of common interest, which include:

1. The development and updating of a complete list of all individuals who are responsible for research at the California community colleges, under the direction of Mr. Walter L. Brooks. This list is formed at the present time and will be sent from the CJCA office in the near future. Mr. Brooks will continue to assume the responsibility for updating this on an annual basis.

2. In order that additional improvement may be made in the communication of research findings, the Committee has taken several steps. Under the direction of Mr. Robert J. Fitch, a statewide newsletter will be prepared biannually. In this newsletter, two classes of research will receive attention in an abbreviated or paragraph form, wherein completed projects as well as those in progress will be reported in the newsletter. In addition, meeting announcements, job announcements, and other information of interest to those involved in research at the community college will be included. Other efforts to facilitate communication of research include coordinating research committee minutes with both the northern and southern California research groups. In addition, items of interest will continue to appear in the CJCA News.

3. A problem common to the California junior colleges is the receipt of questionnaires that have been either ill conceived or prepared under the stress of time in such a fashion that the questions cannot be answered or that appear to have little value once they have been answered. In an attempt to provide a constructive solution to this continuing problem, the CJCA Committee on Research and Development will place itself at the disposal of various agencies such as the American Association of Junior Colleges, the Office of the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges, the Coordinating Council for Higher Education, as well as CJCA. We will offer our services to review such questionnaires and/or seek the cooperation of a few (two or three) community colleges to review such questionnaires on a pilot basis. In effect, this will allow some community college participation prior to the dissemination of requests for information. It is hoped that this will result in clear questions, that the data requested will be available

* Member CJCA R&D Committee

so colleges can answer such questions, and that the questions will have some practical meaning to the community colleges as well as those who are asking them. This will be made available through a committee consisting of Dr. James W. Keene serving as Chairman, Mrs. Lorine A. Aughinbaugh, Mr. Robert J. Fitch, Mrs. Anna Gale Davis, and Dr. Thomas F. MacMillan.

4. In an attempt to continue the training of research persons in the California community colleges, the CJCA Committee on Research and Development has held a number of training sessions. We proposed earlier this year to hold another intensive training session during the latter part of this summer and heard from approximately twenty community colleges who indicated an interest in participating. However, the lateness of the hour as well as the need for such colleges to make a firm commitment, suggested that this should be postponed until the following calendar year. Announcements detailing the purpose of these institutes, information that will be covered, format, costs, etc., will be sent to the various community colleges during October of the coming college year. In the meantime, informal institutes will be held in the northern as well as in the southern part of the state.

5. For approximately two years, the Committee on Research and Development has been concerned with the formulation of a common data bank among the California junior colleges. It is with considerable relief that the Committee notes that the final hurdle in making this a reality has been overcome and it is expected that an announcement of the person who will work with the Chancellor's office in heading up the formulation and review of such a data bank will be forthcoming within the next few days. The implications of this effort have been discussed several times with the Board of Directors, and it is anticipated that the formation of a common data bank will give direction to the kinds of questions posed by the colleges, the Chancellor's office, and the Legislature. It should be clearly understood that this will be a major undertaking and will have policy as well as critical ramifications on funding and the assessment of the impact of junior college education. Considerable effort on the part of all community colleges will be required to insure the development of a data base that is truly meaningful for community colleges, and that will provide the kind of information that is reflective of the institutions we serve.

Second Session

WHAT DO YOU HEAR?
(Let's Role Play our Problem Areas)

*Anna Gale Davis, Psychology Instructor, Los Angeles Pierce College
Chairman

In role playing a person acts out the behavior of a certain individual in a certain situation. He may act as he himself did on a particular occasion or perhaps as he should have acted. He may try on another person's role. Role playing before an audience gives the audience and the persons involved an opportunity to gain an awareness of feelings and attitudes which may be evoked by the discussion of various topics in true to life settings.

At the Second Session of the Asilomar Conference four role playing situations were conducted. The topics for the situations were selected from workshop group topics already determined by the R & D committee. R and D committee members, as well as other conference participants, were invited to take roles in the four sessions. Parts (or roles) of players were assigned to insure that college and community personnel ordinarily involved in the discussions held would be represented.

During the sessions realistic problems emerged and various viewpoints were voiced which were similar to those with which college personnel have to deal almost on a day to day basis.

Individuals in the audience as well as those participating in the role playing were able to empathize with feelings which were expressed and to identify with persons attempting to solve some rather difficult problems.

At the conclusion of the role playing sessions the conference members attended small workshop groups to discuss the pre-determined set of topics and to formulate some researchable problem areas. It is hoped that the "role playing" activities were instrumental in getting people involved in the topic areas and in motivating them to share their ideas and feelings with others.

*Member, CJCA R&D Committee

MATERIALS GIVEN TO WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

Exhibit I Worksheet for Discussion Groups

Exhibit II CJCA Committee on Research and Development
Criteria for Acceptance of
Presented Research Proposals

Exhibit I

WORKSHEET FOR DISCUSSION GROUPS

The "Evaluation of Reality" is at best a demanding task. Our purpose in the discussion groups is to provide a frame of reference within which it may be possible to focus some of the problems of "research" in a few critical areas of "reality" on the Community College campus.

The R and D Committee has developed a list of Criteria for Acceptance of research proposals, which is attached to these instructions. In your discussion groups you are to act as a research and development committee in formulating an approach to the investigation of some critical aspect of "reality"--militancy, activism, experimentation, the decision-making process or whichever aspect of these "realities" intrigues you most.

Following the R and D guidelines, you should give priority in your discussions to the following items:

1. What is the problem to be investigated? (What needs evaluation? What consequences of evaluation are expected? What is the evidence of institutional readiness to develop and execute a research project in this specific area of need? What evidence, if any, is there that the problem is defined in the same way by participants?)

2. What are the criterion variables to be used in an evaluation of the problem? (What behavior is to be observed, what opinions sampled, what performance quantified, etc.)

3. What are the hypotheses or expected results of the research proposal?

4. What specific procedures are to be employed in the "Evaluation" of the particular "reality" under investigation? (What instruments might be appropriate, what techniques, what statistical methods?)

It shall be the responsibility of each discussion group to present <u>two</u> proposals for evaluative research in the area of the discussion topic.

Please use the four questions above as your guidelines, and keep a set of notes as your discussion progresses. <u>Each group shall present its proposals at the closing session of the conference</u>.

Exhibit II

CJCA COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
CRITERIA FOR ACCEPTANCE OF
PRESENTED RESEARCH PROPOSALS

The componet titles that should comprise a sound research proposal include:

1. Project identification (title)

   A good project title should very concisely identify: (1) the variables included in the study; (2) the type of relationship that may be inferred between the variables; and (3) the population to whom the results may be applied.

2. Statement of the problem to be solved or situation to be improved

3. Justification for proposal approach

   Will the results of the study have any practical value rather than simply being an interesting pursuit?

4. Operational research objectives, hypotheses, and/or questions

   To assure that the proposal is presented in sharp form, it is necessary to state the hypotheses, objectives, or questions in operational terms--that is, the procedures and/or behavioral outcomes must be clearly specified and observable.

5. Sequence of operations and procedures to be used in solving problem

   This component of a research proposal is variously labeled method, procedure, or in one instance, method or procedure. The basic function of this component is to describe the operations that will be performed to solve the problem of concern.

6. Evaluation of data

   Specification of the quantitative procedures to be used.

California Junior College Association
1020 Twelfth Street
Sacramento, California 95814

January 29, 1970

DISCUSSION TOPICS FOR WORKSHOP GROUPS

1. Black and Third World Opportunity Programs: Expansion or Extortion?

   Are Black Studies and Mexican American Studies serving any function? How can we tell? What are criterion variables for evaluation of special recruitment programs?

2. Educational Decision-Making: Who Decides? Who Decides?

   What data on what variables are being gathered locally, regionally and statewide; by whom and for what purposes? What intra-college pressures operate in the decision-making process? How can the decision-making process be evaluated at various levels?

3. Innovations and Educational Technology: Hawthorne, Halo, or Hutzpah?

   Do the modern hardware-software instructional programs have anything going for them besides the Hawthorne effect? Are there "exportable" innovations? How well used are the audio-tutorial labs, and what variables are related to their successful use?

4. The "Community" in the Community College: Extending the Reach.

   What is the responsibility of the community college to the community? How successful are the programs? What should characterize community programs? On what basis should decisions be made; philosophical or empirical?

5. Student Activism: Thrust or Threat?

   How do we account for variance in student activism other than the minority push? Is the thrust altruistic or selfish? How about the turned on, tuned in dropout scene?

6. Faculty Militancy: Quis Custodes Ipsos Custodiet?

   What are the directions of faculty power? On what levels are the new exercises of faculty power likely to be felt, and with what consequences? What are criterion variables?

Group 1

BLACK AND THIRD WORLD OPPORTUNITY PROGRAMS: EXPANSION OR EXTORTION?

Leaders: Larry Crouchett, Diablo Valley College
Don Wilson, Los Angeles City College

Consultant: Ben Gold, Los Angeles City College

Recorder: Lance Rogers, City College of San Francisco

Group 1

BLACK AND THIRD WORLD OPPORTUNITY PROGRAMS: EXPANSION OR EXTORTION?

PROPOSAL I

It is proposed to investigate the impact of the Black and Third World Opportunity Programs in the community colleges on the minority student.

Impact is defined as:

a. The changes that the minority student perceives as having taken place in himself.

b. The changes that occur in the academic performance of the minority student. (Such changes will be measured from a detached analysis of academic performance and records.)

c. The changes that occur in the vocational performance of the minority student in relation to his college educational program.

Black and Third World Opportunity Programs are defined as follows:

a. Special recruitment efforts

b. Special financial aids: (1) Direct; (2) Indirect

c. Special counseling

d. Ethnic curriculums

e. Tutorial services

f. Special curriculums: (1) Readiness; (2) Remedial; etc.

Minority Student: A student of an ethnic background other than "other white" as defined by the State Department.

Justification for proposal approach:

a. Results could form basis for future application for special funding.

b. Results could form basis on which to make decisions to continue or cancel or revise the program.

Expected results of research proposed are that these programs do indeed have a marked effect.

Instruments, Techniques, etc.

a. A questionnaire must be developed to ascertain the perceptions of the minority student toward these special programs.

b. Interviews in depth are suggested for each of these students.

Group 1

c. Analysis of personnel records, placement records, etc., of these students.

d. Analysis of the difference between local norms (specifically developed) and those of the students being interviewed-- to get at the vocational performance measures.

PROPOSAL II

It is proposed to perform an analysis of the perceptions of the faculty regarding the efforts of the ethnic studies program on their courses.

Null Hypothesis: The perceptions of the faculty have NOT changed over time.

Questionnaires to be developed and used.

Justification for approach proposed:

From the reactions we would modify the program.

Criterion Variables

What should be sampled? (no particular order)

Do we have any members of an ethnic minority in your class?

Have you modified your teaching techniques to meet the needs of the minority students?

Are you providing opportunities for the minorities to succeed?

Has there been any change in your attitude toward minorities in the previous period of time as a result of the special program?

Have you noticed any observable difference in the performance of students who have been in these programs?

Do you favor expansion of ethnic courses in your department?

Expected Results: It is expected faculty to say programs are worthwhile. This should affect decisions that are made concerning the scope and content of the programs.

Instruments, (appropriate), Techniques:

Questionnaire (opinionnaire) given to faculty in this case.

Group 2

EDUCATIONAL DECISION-MAKING: WHO DECIDES? WHO DECIDES?

Leader: James Keene, San Joaquin Delta College

Consultant: Chuck McIntyre, Coordinating Counsel of Higher Education

Recorder: Don Kester, Chabot College

Group 2

EDUCATIONAL DECISION-MAKING: WHO DECIDES? WHO DECIDES?

General Model

1. Statement of the problem: What is the nature of the decision-making process in contemporary community colleges? The expectation is that better and wider understanding of the decision-making process will result from this investigation. Institutional readiness to develop and execute a research project in this area is evidenced by the actions of various groups to increase their degree of participation in the decision-making process. There is little evidence that the problem is defined in the same way by the participants; indeed, this is one reason why this problem needs to be researched.

   The following dissection of the decision-making process into stages is offered:

   a. The need for change is perceived.

   b. An adequate degree of urgency is recognized.

   c. A clarifying statement of the problem is made.

   d. The factors relevant to the problem are identified.

   e. The alternative courses of action are identified.

   f. The probable consequences of each alternative course of action is described.

   g. The positive and negative consequences are compared.

   h. A choice is made for a certain course of action.

   i. The course of action is implemented; a strategy is developed and pursued.

2. The criterion variable to be used in the evaluation of this problem is the degree of acceptance and satisfaction expressed by those people who are the most directly affected by those decisions.

3. General Hypothesis: The present decision-making process in community colleges is no longer relevant for the changing needs of those involved.

   Specific Hypothesis: The present decision-making process in community colleges is neither sufficiently acceptable nor sufficiently satisfying to those directly affected by those decisions.

Group 2

4. Questionnaires and/or interviews which measure this degree of acceptance and satisfaction of those directly involved are appropriate. Chi-square analyses could be performed if answers were trichotomized into high, average and low degree of satisfaction.

   A specific case study could be made given a particular problem. For example:

   Statement of the Problem: Who decides whether or not the college will have a classification testing program? The following variables are relevant: the empirical local validity not only of the proposed testing instrument but also of other instruments; the apparent attitude of the community toward using tests to classify and track students; who the people are who are advocating testing or non-testing, and why. Under the general model, the degree of acceptance and satisfaction of students, administrators, faculty, parents, and taxpayers need to be assessed.

Group 3

INNOVATIONS AND EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY: HAWTHORNE, HALO OR HUTZPAH?

Leader: Robert Carman, Santa Barbara City College

Consultant: Malcolm McAfee, Napa College and Cal State, Hayward

Recorder: Paul Preising, San Jose City College

Group 3

INNOVATIONS AND EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY: HAWTHORNE, HALO OR HUTZPAH?

The following array of possible problems have been identified. The last two problems are recommended for further development.

Suggested Areas for Research

1. What instructor characteristics are correlated with successful-unsuccessful implication of an already effective social studies program in another setting?

   Rationale: If we get answers to above, we can relate instructors in such a way that probability of successful implementation in another setting is possible.

   Mentorex and Fields: Although it worked in one setting, it failed in another. Could use Mentorex and Fields study and go to schools where successful and study variables of instruction associated with successful implementation of program. How do you control for effect of situation variables? Maybe we could do some population validation studies?

2. Does the use of behavior objectives as design criteria increase content learning? You may get differences in quantile changes although overall change may be the same.

   Rationale: If study objectives in behavioral terms do not facilitate learning as compared to classes taught without these objectives, why support behavioral objectives?

   Method: Measurement of above would involve experimental versus control group on the tests -- one would be a standardized achievement test; the other a behavioral objective relevant test.

3. Although a considerable number of innovations are developed and proven effective in a given setting, seldom are those innovations replicated in other settings. Given the above, there is value in examining the characteristics of institutions and instructors with the idea of predicting the degree to which a given innovation, effective in one situation, will be effectively implemented in another.

   The purpose of this research is to examine the following questions:

   a. What are the characteristics of instructors (or institutions) with effective replication who are involved in innovative programs as compared to those involved with noneffective replication of innovative programs.

b. Will the performance of students given the Fullerton Algebra auto tutorial program be significantly (P=05) higher in schools where the teacher and institutional variables are associated positively with replication of innovations as compared to student performance in a random sample of control group schools.

The group concluded there were too many variables in the above study that would make researching it almost impossible. For example, what variable--tape recorder, rural-urban, software, hardware, etc., can be controlled?

However, it was also pointed out that the first problem, above, had significance in that it may be possible to isolate a personality characteristic of instructors who are effective in replicating or innovation and that presence of that factor may be the means whereby a given innovation may be effective in a disparate setting.

Methodology

The question above would be measured as follows. Schools would be categorized on replication in terms of effective or noneffective. The selected instructor characteristics would be cross tabbed with replication. The design is depicted below:

REPLICATION

	Effective	Noneffective
HI Teacher		
MED Characteristics		
LO		

Basically, a series of chi-square tests of independence will be performed. The research hypotheses would take the following form: There is a significant difference (P=05) between replication as compared to teacher characteristics X_____ as measured on the _____scale.

4. In a time when community colleges are facing increased financial constraint, it is increasingly important to determine the value of costly expenditures for technological hardware prior to purchase. All too often language labs, films, filmstrips are purchased simply because it is in vogue to do so. A community college without a language lab is considered obsolete.

   The purpose of this research is to design a general model for evaluating whether or not students make significant gains as a result of being exposed to selected hardware as compared to a control group taught without the use of this hardware.

The general form of this type of research question is as follows: Will students taught X using the usual teaching techniques plus one additional piece of hardware, i.e., cassette, tape recorder, etc., perform significantly (P=05) higher on some performance tests (standard test or teacher made) as compared to a randomly selected control group?

Methodology

A sample of 100 students will be selected at random from the population of students who will receive the hardware at a given community college. (Cost/benefit analysis can be used to select a specific piece of hardware from an array of similar items.)

The experimental group will be assigned at random the use of the given piece of hardware while the control group will be taught sans this particular hardware. The research hypotheses to be tested will take the following form:

> Experimental group students will perform significantly higher (P=05) on _____test as compared to the control group.
>
> Data will be analyzed using a t test for significant differences of means of two independent groups. The research design can take either of the following forms, the latter being preferred:
>
> Pretest -- Post test Experimental Control Group Design
>
> R O_1 O_2
>
> R O_3 O_4
>
> or
>
> Post test only design
>
> R O_1
>
> R X O_2

Inferences

If hypothesis is supported and cost of hardware is reasonable -- buy. If not, don't buy.

Group 4

THE "COMMUNITY" IN THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE: EXTENDING THE REACH

Leader: Tim Welch, Cabrillo College

Consultant: William Wenrich, College of San Mateo

Recorder: Walter Brooks, Shasta College

Group 4

THE "COMMUNITY" IN THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE: EXTENDING THE REACH

1. Title: Who Uses College X ?

2. The purpose of the study is to determine the extent and degree of contact which has occurred between the local community college and the individual households in the community.

3. A simple but important aspect of the relevance of the community college is how many people are affected by it. If it is found that there is significant contact, the study will probably serve only a public relations function. If contact is low, the study will act as a stimulus for developing better community relations.

4. Since we are dealing with an information-gathering study rather than an experimental design, many of the requirements in item four do not apply. The following do apply.

   Operational Definitions:

   A. Community

      1. The community for the purposes of this study would consist of a randomly selected sample of names from the telephone directory in the community served. While not completely adequate, the group identified in this manner was thought to be sufficiently representative for the purpose of this study.

      2. Significant Community Contact: It was decided that it was not within the role of the researcher to place a value on this measurement. It would be the job of Community Services, Personnel, the college president, and the board of trustees to decide what percent of the community population they expected to serve or thought they were serving. Obviously if less than a majority of the community households had a minimum contact with the college, the college would probably best refer to itself as a junior college.

   B. Procedure

      The research instrument: It was thought that a high return rate would be obtained if the questionnaire used in this survey was kept simple and straight foreward, asking only those questions which were necessary to accomplish the purpose of the study. The questions would be listed on a fold-over post card and mailed to those identified in the study group. A follow-up could be mailed the following week.

B. Procedure (continued)

The questions included on the card are as follows:

1. Is there a two-year community college or junior college in your area?

2. What is the name of the college?

It was felt that these two questions would tell us whether or not the respondent had a minimum identification with the college.

3. Have you or a family member visited the college for any purpose?

4. Have you or a family member attended an event or meeting sponsored by the college?

5. Have you or a family member attended a class sponsored by the college?

Questions 3 - 5 are designed to determine in a very rough sense the degree of use of the college by the individual family.

It was generally agreed among the group that an evaluation question would be appropriate -- on the quality of the service rendered.

A study of the presently enrolled students evaluation of adult classes was discussed but not precisely defined.

In summary, we did not get far with the formally assigned task but a meaningful exchange of ideas did occur.

Group 5

STUDENT ACTIVISM: THRUST OR THREAT?

Leader: Jack Bessire, Monterey Peninsula College

Consultant: Wm. Deegan, CJCA

Recorder: Otto Heinkel, San Diego Community Colleges

Group 5

STUDENT ACTIVISM: THRUST OR THREAT?

We did not define a researchable problem.

After several hours of intensive discussion the above conclusion was reached. It was agreed that a historical approach of what has happened on different campuses could be taken, but it was also agreed that this was not research. Although the historical approach might provide some clues for decision-making, it was not felt that the fluidity of the student groupings and causes would make it impossible to use the experiences of one campus as predictive for another.

The inclusion of a student activist from Monterey Peninsula College in the group helped to point out the difficulty of communication and the ease with which emotions are aroused even in hypothetical situations.

Group 6

FACULTY MILITANCY: QUIS CUSTODES IPSOS CUSTODIET?

Leader: Louis Riess, Pasadena City College

Consultant: Robert Fitch, Cerritos College

Recorder: Maxine Tallman, Moorpark College

Group 6

FACULTY MILITANCY: QUIS CUSTODES IPSOS CUSTODIET?

Title: A study to determine those factors which lead to faculty dissatisfaction.

1. Statement of the Problem:

There has been enough evidence to suggest that there is dissatisfaction within many faculties regarding salaries, academic freedom, administrative practices, etc. In some educational institutions this dissatisfaction seems to have caused a disruption of the normal educational process.

2. Hypotheses:

a. There will be more faculty militancy (overt action) in schools where faculty members have strong feelings of dissatisfaction.

b. There are certain causitive factors which are common to schools having a high degree of militancy.

3. Methodology:

Develop a questionnaire to determine degree of dissatisfaction which would be distributed to every faculty senate president in the California Community Colleges. In addition, the faculty senate president would indicate the degree of overt militant action which had taken place in his school, e.g., refusal to obey directives, striking, violent actions, petitions submitted, political actions, raising of money in support of issues, etc.

From these responses, the three schools indicating the highest degree of dissatisfaction and militancy would be compared with the three schools displaying the least degree of dissatisfaction and militancy. These six schools would then participate in the final phase of the study. Each faculty member from the six schools would elicit the various areas of discontent. The areas that differentiate between high dissatisfaction schools and low dissatisfaction schools would be listed as causes.

4. Use of Results:

Any school which displayed an interest in evaluating the degree of dissatisfaction within the faculty could use the instruments developed in the study to compare the results they obtained with the results of the study.

Final Session

WORKSHOP SUMMARY

The recorder from each workshop presented the summary from his workshop to the conference participants. Many questions and comments followed the presentations.

Following the presentation of the workshop reports the following individuals were asked to report on current research in which they were engaged or had just completed.

Ben Gold	The Fall, 1969 Student Counselor Assistant Program: An Evaluation
Anna Gale Davis	The use of the psychology staff for "in depth counseling" at Los Angeles Pierce College
Tom MacMillan	Phase II - Nor Cal Study
Richard Brightman	Project Follow-through

The last hour of the converence was spent in open discussion from the floor. Some of the topics persued were the implications of line item accounting for instructional output for research, the need to work closely with the staff of AAJC, CJCA and the California Community College Chancellor's Office in reducing the number and improving the quality of questionnaires from these and other state and federal offices, the overlapping of research and grantsmanship responsibilities, and the growing need for workshops to assist faculty members interested in conducting viable research.

Ben Gold requested each participant fill out the following questionnaire.

Please complete and return to Ben Gold before you leave. Thank you.

TO: Participants in 1970 Research Conference, Asilomar

FROM: Ben Gold, Los Angeles City College

SUBJECT: PROPOSED ARTICLE FOR ERIC PUBLICATION

Art Cohen has approached me about writing an article about the current state of institutional research efforts in the community college. I agreed to try to get some preliminary information from you and then consider the project further.

I would be most appreciative if you would take a few minutes and answer the attached questions.

Many thanks.

PRELIMINARY SURVEY ON THE CURRENT STATE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH EFFORTS IN THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Name of College_____ Approximate full-time enrollment_____

Name of person responding_____

1. What budget allocation does your college make for I.R.?

2. What personnel allocation?

3. How would you describe generally your college's I.R. efforts - long-range planning? Problem solving? Or ? ?

4. What are the major topics of I.R. concern?

5. Who decides what studies to make?

6. Do you produce formal research reports? If so, how many per year?

7. How and to whom are research findings communicated?

8. Do you have any evidence that I.R. has influenced decision making on your campus?

_____ If so, please describe.

9. How would you compare your college's present I.R. efforts with those five years ago?

10. Does your college join with others in cooperative I.R. efforts? _____
If so, please describe.

11. Do you know of anything going on relating to I.R. that might be described in a "current state" paper (new approaches, conferences, etc.)? Please describe briefly and tell me who to contact.

12. What do you see as the greatest need in I.R. at present?

Many thanks.

EVALUATION OF THE CONFERENCE

This years conference, as those in the past, was rated very favorably. Those who responded to the evaluation questionnaire repeatedly described it as "stimulating," "informative," and "productive."

Thirty people returned the evaluation questionnaire. How they rated specific parts of the conference is shown in the table below. The figures are in percentages.

	No Value 1	2	3	4	Maximum Value 5
1. The Opening Session	0	27	35	23	15
2. The Happy Hour	4	20	28	28	20
3. The Role Playing Session	0	11	36	28	25
4. Workshop Groups	0	17	17	36	30
5. Workshop Summary	0	11	41	33	15
6. The Camaraderie of Tuesday Evening	0	12	20	44	24
7. The Discussion of Research Reports	0	7	22	41	30

Many people took the trouble to make comments and suggestions and the remarks were generally very favorable and constructive. The respondents indicated that the primary value of the conference was the opportunity it offered them to communicate with other researchers. Over one-third of the comments stated that the conference was a success because it gave them a chance to share information with others and to find out what other schools are doing in terms of research, innovations in curriculum, etc. Suggestions on improving the conference also emphasized the communication of information. Eleven of the 30 respondents suggested that they would like to hear more research reports and have more time to discuss what other schools are doing. Three people stated that the discussion of the research projects during the Wednesday morning session was the best part of the conference. Several people also suggested that the conference could be improved by having speakers who are involved in research of informed about the problems of the community college. Some people suggested that we have speakers from the University, CJCA or the Chancellor's office. Others suggested that we have people who are "experts" in such areas as data processing, grantsmanship, or the planning, organization and implementation of an effective institutional research program.

Most people felt the workshops were informative and stimulating, but several people felt there was not enough time to deal with such complex problems. It was suggested that the workshop groups should be more structured and that the topics or problems be carefully selected so that they could be completed in the limited time available.

Several people also commented on the utilization of time during the three days. Some felt that too much of the first day was wasted and others noted that not enough people attended the Wednesday morning meeting. As noted previously, the respondents felt that future conferences would be better if more time was devoted to speakers and the discussion of research reports. Perhaps more of the first day could be utilized for these purposes.

I'm sure next years conference will be even a greater success and I look forward to seeing all of you again next spring. Next year the conference will be held on April 7 through April 9. Be sure to mark your calendar! See you there.

Robert J. Fitch

APPENDIX - CONFERENCE REGISTRANTS

Aughinbaugh, Lorine A., American River College
Baysdorfer, Lloyd G., Merritt College
Becker, Robert E., Rio Hondo College
Bell, Max D., Mt. San Antonio College
Bessire, Jack D., Monterey Peninsula College
Bibbo, John, Southwestern College
Borst, Philip W., Fullerton Junior College
Brightman, Richard W., Orange Coast Junior College District
Brooks, Walter L., Shasta College
Carman, Robert, Santa Barbara City College
Cook, Robert J., Los Angeles Southwest College
Crouchett, Larry, Diablo Valley College
Davis, Anna Gale, Los Angeles Pierce College
Deegan, William, CJCA Consultant
Farley, Catherine, Merritt College
Fitch, Robert J., Cerritos College
Ginet, Carol, Moorpark College
Gold, Ben K., Los Angeles City College
Goldman, Phyllis, Contra Costa College
Hein, Marilyn, Cabrillo College
Heinkel, Otto A., San Diego Community Colleges
Hinton, John, Diablo Valley College
Holmes, Paul L. Laney College
Horton, Robert E., Los Angeles Valley College
Jacobsen, Richard Carl, College of the Sequoias
Keene, James W., San Joaquin Delta College
Kennedy, G., Compton College
Kester, Don, Chabot College
Klampe, Dean G., San Diego Community Colleges
Krehbiel, Edward L., Grossmont College
Laird, William, Los Angeles Trade-Tech. College
Lit, Mark, West Los Angeles College
Leonard, Ron, Monterey Peninsula College
Locks, Charles S., Los Angeles Valley College
MacMillan, Thomas F., Napa College
Madsen, Gibb R., Chabot College
McAfee, Malcolm, Napa College
Murdoff, Virginia, Napa College
Nutter, Jerry, California Community Colleges
Pearce, Frank C., College of San Mateo
Preising, Paul, San Jose City College
Riess, Louis C., Pasadena City College
Rogers, Lance, City College of San Francisco
Sanden, Milton R., Bakersfield College
Sheldon, Stephen, University of California, Los Angeles
Smith, DeBoyd L., West Valley Junior College
Swanson, Herbert L., El Camino College
Tallman, Maxine, Moorpark College
Walsh, William J., Canada College
Welch, Tim, Cabrillo College
Wenrich, William, College of San Mateo
Wilson, Don, Los Angeles City College